

## Serial Verb Construction in Marathi

Rajeshwari Pandharipande  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

### 1. Introduction

Serial verb construction (SVC hereafter) in Marathi has been discussed in traditional grammars (e.g., Damle 1911, etc.), typological studies (Kachru and Pandharipande 1980, and Masica 1976), and in Pandharipande 1989. However, a number of basic and important issues remain unresolved till today: (a) does Marathi have a SVC? (the issue of defining the status of SVC in Marathi), (b) why does SVC in Marathi have split properties, i.e., why does it share morphological, syntactic, and semantic properties with other (non-SVC) constructions in the language?, and (c) what are the constraints on the compatibility (pairing) of the verbs in SVC.

This paper attempts to resolve the above issues. The major claim of the paper is that in order to resolve the above issues it is necessary to take into account first the mechanism of the derivation of SVC and secondly to examine the morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic properties of SVC in Marathi.

### 2. SVC in Marathi

First, I will illustrate the SVC construction in Marathi and then argue that it has to be treated as a SVC as opposed to either a compound verb construction (CVC hereafter) or a verb + auxiliary construction.

A SVC in Marathi, similar to SVC verbs in other Indian and African languages, typically involves a sequence of a verb ( $V_1$ ) + verb ( $V_2$ ), in which  $V_1$  has generally called the main verb, while the  $V_2$  has been called an explicator (since it explicates/extends the meaning of the  $V_1$ ). The most frequently used explicators in Marathi (see Damle 1911) are listed in (1). The explicator verbs include both transitive and intransitive verbs and can follow both transitive and intransitive main verbs (see (1.) below).

- (1) Serial verb = main verb (V<sub>1</sub>) + explicator (V<sub>2</sub>)  
stem + *ūn*

Explicator Verbs:	General meaning:
(a) <i>de</i> 'give' (tr.)	[action performed for someone other than the agent]
(b) <i>ghe</i> 'take' (tr.)	[for agent]
(c) <i>tāk</i> 'deep' (tr.)	[to get rid of]
(d) <i>bas</i> 'sit' (intr.)	[inadvertantly]
(e) <i>dzā</i> 'go' (intr.)	[by mistake, action away from the agent/speaker]
(f) <i>ye</i> 'come' (intr.)	[action toward agent]
(g) <i>kāḡh</i> 'draw' (tr.)	['draw' to the last point]
(h) <i>sod</i> 'leave' (tr.)	['leave' at the point, of completion]
(i) <i>bagh</i> 'see' (tr.)	[try]
(j) <i>thev</i> 'keep' (tr.)	[completion of an action]

- (2) Examples:

- (i) *karūn de* to  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{do} \\ \text{work} \end{array} \right\}$  for someone other than the agent  
of the action  
do give
- (ii) *karūn ghe* to  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{do} \\ \text{work} \end{array} \right\}$  for the agent of the action  
do take
- (iii) *bolūn bas* 'to say inadvertently'
- (iv) *radūn ghe* 'to cry for oneself'

## 2.1 Morphology of SVC

In a SVC, V<sub>1</sub> consist of a stem + the suffix -*ūn* which it commonly shares with the V<sub>1</sub> in the conjunctive participle construction (see examples 3, 4, and 5). V<sub>1</sub> has the invariant stem form. V<sub>2</sub> takes all markers of tense, aspect, and agreement. Consider examples (3) and (4) where the form of V<sub>1</sub> *karūn* (3) and *bolūn* (4) remain unchanged, while the explicator verbs *tāk* (3) and *gelā* (4) respectively, take the markers of agreement, tense, and aspect. The question is whether it is merely by accident that the suffix *ūn* on V<sub>1</sub> is homophonous with the suffix on V<sub>1</sub> in the conjunctive participle construction, or whether the SVC shares some other features with the conjunctive participle construction.

Examples:

- (3) *tū he kām karūn ṭāk*  
 you this work do drop  
 2p.sg.Imp.  
 Get this work done.

- (4) *Madhū he bolūn gelā*  
 madhū this say went  
 3p.sg.mas.  
 Madhū said this (inadvertently).

- (5) *Madhū he bolūn ghari gelā*  
 madhū this having said home went  
 3p.sg.mas.  
 Having said this, Madhū went home.

Note the suffix *-ūn* on *V<sub>1</sub>* and the tense, and agreement markers on *V<sub>2</sub>*.

In Marathi there are *V + V* sequences other than the type discussed above. The question is whether all of them qualify as SVC, and more importantly, what the criterion is for determining a *V + V* sequence to be a SVC.

Let us consider the following *V + V* sequences:

- (6) *V + śak-ṇe* 'to be able to'  
 (can)
- (7) *V (imperf.) + as-ṇe* 'habitual action (i.e., to habitually perform  
 (to be) an action)'
- (8) *V (imperf.) + rāh-ṇe* 'continuous action' (i.e., to keep doing an  
 (remain) action)
- (9) *V (imperf.) + dzā-ṇe* 'habitual/repeated/regular action (i.e., to  
 (go) perform an action habitually/  
 repeatedly/regularly)

The following examples (6a) - (9a) illustrate the use of *V+* sequences in (6) - (9).

- (6a) *to he kām karū śakto*  
 he this work do can  
 He can do this work.
- (7a) *mī he gāṇa mhaṇat ase*  
 I this song sing used to  
 I used to sing this song.
- (8a) *to te gāṇa mhaṇat rāhiā-tyātsā*  
 he that song sing kept on - its  
*artha na samadztā*  
 meaning not understanding  
 He kept on singing that song without understanding its  
 meaning.
- (9a) *tū hirvyā bhādzyā khāt dzā*  
 you green vegetable eat regularly  
*mhaṇdže tud<sup>3</sup>ī tabyet tsānglī hoīl*  
 then your health good will be  
 Eat green vegetables regularly, then your health will improve  
 (literally, will be good).

Note that morphologically, the verbs in (6a) - (9a) can be labelled as SVs. However, they are different from the SVs in (1). *śakṇe* 'can' (6a) is an auxiliary and is never used as an independent verb. In this sense, it is similar to the verb 'can' in English. In contrast to this the explicator verbs in (1) are used as single verbs independently of SVC. Verbs ( $V_2$ s) in (7a) - (9a) can be used as independent, single verbs elsewhere. However, the meaning of these  $V_2$  is completely grammaticalized, i.e., the  $V_2$ s are completely 'bleached' of their meaning and function as aspectual markers. Therefore,  $V_1 + V_2$  of the type in (6a) - (9a) is an open set. Practically, any  $V_1$  can be paired with  $V_2$  to convey the meanings (mostly aspectual) mentioned above. The pairing of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  is restricted, not on the basis of the compatibility of the lexical meaning of  $V_2$  with  $V_1$ , but rather, on the basis of the compatibility of  $V_1$  with the grammaticalized/aspectual meaning of  $V_2$ . For example, a verb such as *mar-ṇe* 'to die' can not be combined with *as-ṇe* (7), *rāh-ṇe* (8) or *dzā-ṇe* (9) because of the ontological incompatibility of  $V_1$  to take the aspectual meanings conveyed by the above.

The  $V_2$ s in this class of verbs are totally affixal in their function. They do not have a syntactic or semantic status of a verb, i.e., they do not have any arguments, or meaning (independently of  $V_1$ ). They do not convey the meanings independently of  $V_1$ . Marathi does not have other affixes (besides those auxiliary verbs) to carry out their grammatical function. Also, similar to  $V +$  affix combinations, the SV in this class do not allow any intervention of any morpheme between  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ . Moreover, similar to affixes or auxiliary verbs, the sequential order of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  is irreversible.  $V_2$  may take inflections of tense, gender, and number agreement (if it is the last element in the sentence).

The set of SV described in (1) is different from this class (as will be demonstrated in detail in section 3). In the SV in (1), the  $V_2$ s are not as grammaticalized as the  $V_2$  in (6) - (9), in the sense that they are not completely 'bleached' of their lexical meaning. For example, unlike those in (6) - (9), all  $V_2$ s (which are used also as independent single verbs) retain their features of  $\pm$  volitionality, and argument structure in the SVC. Moreover, the SV in (1) allow an emphatic particle to intervene between  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  and optionally, the order of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  can be reversed. One of the major differences between the two sets is that the SV in (1),  $V_1$  is not an open set. Unlike  $V_2$  in (6) - (9),  $V_2$  is not freely attachable to any  $V_1$  in SV in (1). There are syntactic/semantic constraints (see section 8) which determine the compatibility of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ .

The above discussion shows that the two sets of SVs need to be treated differently. In the set in (1), the  $V_2$  retains more verbal properties than the  $V_2$  in (6) - (9). In the former, we are dealing with SV with a pair of (structurally and functionally) two verbs while in latter, we are dealing with a  $V_1 + V_2$  (which is syntactically, semantically, and functionally a grammatical inflection). In the following discussion, I will discuss the set of verbs in (1) as SVs.

### 3. Split properties of SVC: Morphology

In my earlier paper (Pandharipande 1989) it is pointed out that SVC shares morphological, syntactic, and semantic properties with other constructions in the language. In order to facilitate the discussion, I will present the relevant data to substantiate this claim. In section (1) it is already pointed out that  $V_1$  in SV obligatorily takes the suffix *ūn* which it shares with the conjunctive participle (CP hereafter) construction in Marathi.

Another morphological property of a SVC is that it does not readily allow intervention of any element between  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ . This property is commonly shared by a compound. Consider the following examples:

- (10) \*to he *bolūn* *kāl* *gelā*  
 he this say yesterday went  
 He said this (inadvertantly) yesterday.

Note that when an adverbial element *kāl* 'yesterday' intervenes between  $V_1$  - *bolūn* 'say' (literally having said) and  $V_2$  - *gelā* (inadvertantly, literally 'went'), the resulting sentence is ungrammatical.<sup>1</sup> This property of SVC points out an intimate combination of verbs in a SVC (Foley and Van Valin 1984). However, the following example (11) shows that an emphatic particle can intervene between  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ .

- (11) to he *bolūn* *tar* *gelā*  
 he this say (emph.) went  
 indeed  
 Indeed, he said this inadvertently.

Moreover, the order of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  may be optionally switched as in (12).

- (12) *tyāne* *kām* *takla* *karūn*  
 he-ag. work threw do  
 $V_2$   $V_1$   
 He did the work (and got rid of it).

The above discussion points out that SVs are not as intimately combined as compounds nor are they as loosely combined as the pairs of verbs in (6)-(9).

#### 4. Split properties of SVs: Syntax

A close examination of the syntactic properties of SVs in the following discussion shows that some syntactic phenomena (such as passivization, participialization, and verb-agreement) refer to/operate only on  $V_2$ . Causativization refers to both  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ .

##### 4.1 Passivization

Consider the following example (13) where the SV is in the passive form. Note that while  $V_1$  (*toḡūn* 'cut') remains unchanged, all the markers

of passive, i.e., (perfective form of the V<sub>1</sub> *tākli* 'dropped' and the agreement markers (3 person, neuter, plural) are on V<sub>2</sub>.

- (13) *sarkārī*      *hukumānusār*      *sagī*      *dhāḍa*  
 government's order-according to all trees  
 3p.plu.neut.

*toḍūn*      *tākli*      *geli*  
 but 3p. neut.plu.perfect 3p. neut.plu.perfect  
 drop went

According to the government's orders, all the trees were cut down.

#### 4.2 Past Participles

Except for one type of sequence of V<sub>1</sub> + V<sub>2</sub> (i.e. V<sub>1</sub> (intransitive) + V<sub>2</sub> (transitive), all other sequences of V<sub>1</sub> + V<sub>2</sub> (in a SV) may undergo (past) participialization. (Consider examples (14)- (17). Notice that the SV with the V<sub>1</sub> (trans.) + V<sub>2</sub> (trans.) undergoes the process of (past) participialization yielding the participle (*toḍūn tākli* 'cut off') in (14). Similarly (15) and (16) show that the SV with the V<sub>1</sub> (trans.) + V<sub>2</sub> intrans.) (in (15)) and V<sub>1</sub> (intrans.) + V<sub>2</sub> (intrans.) in (16) undergo (past) participialization deriving the participles i.e., *cūk karūn baslelā* 'the boy who made a mistake inadvertently' (8, and *tuḍūn geḷeli* 'being cut off' (16) respectively. However, when the SV with V<sub>1</sub> (intrans.) + V<sub>2</sub> (trans.) sequence is (past) participialized, the resulting sentence (17) is ungrammatical.

Past participles: V<sub>1</sub> (tr.) + V<sub>2</sub> (tr.)

*toḍ*      +      *tāk*      =      *toḍūn tākne* 'to cut off'  
 cut/break      drop

- (14) *tyāne*      *toḍūn*      *tākli*      *dhāḍa*      *titha*      *paḍli*      *hoti*  
 he-ag.      cut      drop      trees      there      lay      aux.  
 The trees cut down by him lay there.

- (15) V<sub>1</sub> + V<sub>2</sub>  
tr. + Intr.

*cūk karūn basle lā mulgā*  
mistake do sit boy  
3p.sg.mas.  
The boy who made a mistake (inadvertantly).

- (16) V<sub>1</sub> + V<sub>2</sub>  
Intr. + Intr.

*tuṭūn gelelī phāndī*  
break go branch  
(Intr.) 3p.sg.fem. 3p.sg.fem.  
The branch (which was) broken off.

- (17) When V<sub>1</sub> is intransitive and V<sub>2</sub> is transitive, the formation of past participle is blocked.

*\*dzhopūn ghetle lā mulgā*  
sleep take boy  
The boy who slept (for himself).

#### 4.3 Present Participles

The process of (present) participialization is blocked for the SVs. Consider example (18) where the SV *lihūn/tākne* 'to write (to finish off the job of writing)' has undergone the process of (present) participialization. The resulting sentence is ungrammatical.

- (18) *\*patra lihūn tākat aslelī mulgī*  
letter write drop aux. girl  
The girl who is writing a letter (in order to finish off the job of writing).

#### 4.4 Causativization

Notice that when the SV (19), *karūn gheṇe* 'to work for oneself' is causativized in (19a), V<sub>1</sub> changes from *karūn* 'to work' to *karvūn* 'to make do/work'. No change (other than the tense aspect and the agreement marker) takes place in V<sub>2</sub>. (compare (19) and (19a)).



- (19) *mī kām karūn ghetla*  
 I work do took  
 I did the work (for myself).

- (19a) *mī kām sudhā kaḍūn karvūn ghetla*  
 I work Sudhā by do-caus. took  
 I got the work done (for myself) by Sudhā.

Note that the causative marker can also be placed on  $V_2$  as shown in sentence (20).

- (20) *mū sudhālā kām karāyā lāvie*  
 I Sudhā-acc. work do-caus. attach + past  
 I made Sudhā do the work.

## 5. Verb Agreement

The verb-agreement in Marathi is sensitive to the argument structure of the verb (for further discussion see Pandharipande 1981a): (a) a verb agrees in number, (gender), and person with the agent or patient (subject), if it is not followed by a post position (PP hereafter), (b) if the agent/patient is followed by a PP, it agrees with the theme or object (if it is not followed by a PP), (c) if both (i.e. subject and object) are followed by PPs, the verb remains in its unmarked (3 person, sg. neut.) form. In SVC the verb agreement is sensitive to the arguments of  $V_2$ . Consider the following examples:

- $V_1$  (tr.) +  $V_2$  (tr.)  
 (21) *sudhā patra lihūn ṭākte*  
 sudhā letter write drops  
 Sudhā writes a letter (to get rid of the responsibility of writing it).

- $V_1$  (intr.)  $V_2$  (int.)  
 (22) *sudhā nighūn gelī*  
 sudhā leave went  
 Sudhā went away.

- $V_1$  (tr.) +  $V_2$  (intr.) Note the absence of -ne.  
 (23) *sudhā kām karūn baslī*  
 sudhā work do sat  
 Sudhā did the work (inadvertantly).

- V<sub>1</sub> (intr.) + V<sub>2</sub> (tr.) Note the ergative marking on the agent.  
 (24) *tyāne dzhopūn ghetle*  
       he-erg. sleep took  
               (intr.) (tr.)  
       He slept.

In (21) and (22), it is not clear whether it is the argument of V<sub>1</sub> or V<sub>2</sub> which controls agreement, since V<sub>1</sub> and V<sub>2</sub> in (21) and (22) have an identical argument structure (they are both transitive in (21) and intransitive in (22)). However, (23) and (24) clearly show that it is the argument of V<sub>2</sub> which controls agreement. In (23) the agent *Sudhā* does not take the regular marker of the agent of the transitive verb *karne* 'to do'. *Sudhā* (which controls the agreement), should have taken the agent-marking *-ne* and the verb should have agreed with the theme *kām*. Instead, *Sudhā* fails to take the marking *-ne* and the SV agrees with *Sudhā*. If *Sudhā* is taken to be the *theme* (subject) of *basne* (V<sub>2</sub>) 'to sit', then it is clear that *Sudhā* being the theme (subject) of an intransitive verb does not take *-ne* and consequently the SV agrees with *Sudhā*. In (24) *to* 'he' is the agent of V<sub>2</sub> *ghene* 'to take'. Therefore *to* 'he' takes the agentive marker *-ne* (and as a result the SV fails to agree with it). Had it been the theme (subject) of V<sub>1</sub> *-dzhop-ne* 'to sleep', it should not have taken the marker *-ne* and the verb would have agreed with it.

## 6. Split properties of SVC: Semantics

If we look at the semantic structures of SVC in Marathi, the following two points are immediately clear: (a) the semantic structure of both V<sub>1</sub> and V<sub>2</sub> is relevant for the semantic representation of a SV in which V<sub>1</sub> conveys the primary meaning of the SV and V<sub>2</sub> conveys the adverbial meaning (see discussion in section 1). For example in a SV *karūn gheṇe* 'to do for oneself', *karūn* 'do (literally having done)' conveys the primary meaning, while *gheṇe* 'take' conveys the adverbial meaning. The meaning of a SV is further split up between V<sub>1</sub> and V<sub>2</sub> in that it is V<sub>2</sub> which determines the transitivity/intransitivity of the SV (recall (23) and (24)) and thereby, the agreement pattern is also determined by V<sub>2</sub>. However, the lexical meaning of V<sub>1</sub> is retained while that of V<sub>2</sub> is not.

## 7. Derivation and function of SVC

In order to explain the split nature of the SVC, it is crucial to discuss the derivation and function of the SVC. It is important to remember that two verbs (i.e., V<sub>1</sub> and V<sub>2</sub>) will have to be compatible in order for the

combination of primary meaning of  $V_1$  and adverbial meaning of  $V_2$  to get properly orchestrated.

A close examination of the semantic representation of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  shows that (a) in order for the lexical meaning of  $V_1$  to take on the additional adverbial meaning (conveyed by  $V_2$ ), it is crucial for  $V_1$  to match the semantic features of  $V_2$ . (b) In the above process the semantics of  $V_1$  is modified, (c) this change in semantics of  $V_1$  changes the nature of the argument of  $V_1$ , and (d) this change is reflected in the syntactic properties of the arguments of  $V_1$ .

The supporting evidence for this analysis comes from behavior of the arguments with reference to certain syntactic processes which apply to  $V_1$  when it is used as a single verb but fail to apply to it when it is as a  $V_1$  in a SVC.

#### 7.1 Semantic properties of $V_1$ and $V_2$ : the question of compatibility

Compatibility of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  can be determined on the basis of the pairability of their semantic features (which as will be seen, affect their compatibility at the syntactic level as well). A further breakdown of the semantic features of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  is necessary to investigate their compatibility. Note that the  $V_2$ , in addition to conveying the adverbial meaning, also determines the overall  $\pm$  volitionality of a SV (and thereby the  $\pm$  control of the agent/subject over the action expressed by  $V_1$ ). It is to be further noted that the transitive  $V_2$  conveys +volitional action and + control of the agent; while an intransitive  $V_2$  conveys -volitional action and -control of the agent. Thus the  $V_2$ s (see the list of  $V_2$  in section 1) such as *de* 'to give', *ghe* 'to take', *kādh* 'to draw', *soḍ* 'to leave', *bagh* 'to see', and *they* 'to keep' share two features: (a) +volitionality and (b) +control of their agents.

In Pandharipande 1982, the tests for determining  $\pm$  volitionality and  $\pm$  control have been discussed. It is pointed out that the verbs which express + volitional act and + control of their agent, invariably participate in the causative, passive, and imperative constructions and readily take the adverbials such as 'try to' or 'intentionally,' etc. It was further demonstrated that most generally, transitive verbs express + volitional acts and + control of their subjects/agents while intransitive verbs are lower on the scale of volitionality as well as of the control of their subjects over the actions expressed by them.

The SVs with the intransitive V<sub>2</sub>s (see the list in section 1) such as *bas* 'to sit', *ye* 'to come', and *dzā* 'to go', have a theme rather than an agent, and therefore they are less volitional and convey some control of the subject only if it is +human. The following two examples show that if V<sub>2</sub> is transitive (and therefore +volitional +control of the agent), the SV participates in the imperative construction; while with the intransitive V<sub>2</sub>, a SV fails to participate in it.

- (25) *tū thoda raḍūn ghe*  
 you a little cry take  
 Cry a little (for yourself).

- (26) \**tū te kām karūn bas*  
 you that work do sit  
 Do the work inadvertently.

Note that it is the V<sub>2</sub> which determines the overall volitionality of a SV. For example, in (26) V<sub>1</sub> *kar* 'to do' is a transitive verb and thereby it is +volitional and +control (of the agent). However, since the V<sub>2</sub> *bas* 'sit' is intransitive (and is -volitional here), the SV *karūn basne* 'to do inadvertently' is viewed as -volitional-control (of the agent). Similarly V<sub>1</sub> in (25) *raḍne* 'to cry' is lower on the scale of volitionality and control (since it is generally accepted that one does not have an intention to cry and control over the action of crying). However, the V<sub>2</sub> (in 25) is a transitive verb - *ghe* 'to take' which is higher on the scale of volitionality and control. As a result, the SV is treated as +volitional and +control (of the agent) verb which explains why it participates in the imperative construction. Examples (24) and (25) point out that it is the features of volitionality and control of V<sub>2</sub> which determine the overall features of volitionality and control of the SV. Thus it is only expected that the V<sub>1</sub> is selected on the basis of the compatibility of its features with those of the V<sub>2</sub>, or its modifiability of its features to match those of V<sub>2</sub>. If the features of V<sub>1</sub> and V<sub>2</sub> match then V<sub>1</sub> does not need to be modified. In contrast to this, if they do not match, the semantic representation of V<sub>1</sub> has to be modified. This is exemplified in the following:

- (27)  
 (a) V<sub>1</sub> (transitive) + V<sub>2</sub> (transitive)  
 <agent> [+volitional +control] <agent> [+volitional +control]  
 <theme> <theme>

Resulting SV: *karne* 'to do' + *ghe* = *karūn ghe* 'to do for oneself'

- (b) V<sub>1</sub> is intransitive + V<sub>2</sub> (transitive)  
 <theme> [-volitional -control] <agent> [+volitional +control]

Change = V<sub>1</sub> +volitional +adverbial meaning of V<sub>2</sub>

Resulting SV:

= *dzhopne* 'to sleep' + *ghene* 'to take' = *dzhopūn ghene* 'to sleep for oneself' (volitional)

- (28) If V<sub>2</sub> is intransitive (i.e. *baŋne* 'to sit', *dzāne* 'to go', etc.) it adds the feature of -volitionality to V<sub>1</sub>.

- (a) V<sub>1</sub> (transitive) + V<sub>2</sub> (intransitive)  
 <agent> [+volitional +control] <theme> [-volitional +control]  
 <theme>

Change = V<sub>1</sub> -volitional +adverbial meaning of V<sub>2</sub>

Resulting SV: *karne* 'to do' + *baŋne* 'to sit' = *karūn baŋne* 'to do inadvertently'

- (b) V<sub>1</sub> (intransitive) + V<sub>2</sub> (intransitive) =  
 <theme> [+volition +control] <theme> [+volition +control]

V<sub>1</sub> +volition +adverbial meaning

Resulting SV: *baŋne* 'to sit' + *dzāne* 'to go' = *baŋūn zāne* 'to sit down inadvertently'

- (c) V<sub>1</sub> (intransitive) + V<sub>2</sub> (intransitive)  
 <theme> [-volition -control] <theme> [+volition +control]

= V<sub>1</sub> + adverbial meaning

*sukne* 'to wither' + *dzāne* 'to go' = *sūkūn dzāne* 'to wither away'

Resulting SV: = *sūkūn dzāne* 'to wither completely'

Note that when the features of volitionality and control match (between V<sub>1</sub> and V<sub>2</sub>) no modification in V<sub>1</sub> takes place (see examples (27a) and (28b)). When the features of V<sub>1</sub> and V<sub>2</sub> do not match, V<sub>1</sub> undergoes change. For example, in (27b), V<sub>1</sub> is lower on the overall volitionality scale than V<sub>2</sub>. In this case, V<sub>1</sub> becomes +volitional + control (although it is still lower than V<sub>2</sub> on the scale since its subject argument is a theme (as opposed to an agent)). Similarly, in (28a) the mismatch between V<sub>1</sub> and

V<sub>2</sub> is due to the fact that unlike V<sub>1</sub> which has an agent argument, V<sub>2</sub> has a theme argument. In order to be compatible with V<sub>2</sub>, volitionality of V<sub>1</sub> is lowered. In (28.c) the V<sub>2</sub> *dzāne* 'to go' is lower on the scale of volitionality and control since it has a theme argument. V<sub>1</sub> matches the volitionality feature of V<sub>2</sub> and since the argument of V<sub>1</sub> is human, the adverbial meaning 'inadvertantly' is redundant. In this case, the V<sub>2</sub> only adds the adverbial meaning 'completely' to V<sub>1</sub>.

### 8. Constraints

In the following discussion, I will discuss some of the constraints on pairing of V<sub>1</sub> and V<sub>2</sub>. Let us consider the following combinations of V<sub>1</sub> and V<sub>2</sub> which are not possible in Marathi.

- (29) If V<sub>1</sub> cannot have a volitional agent, V<sub>2</sub> (transitive) cannot be paired with V<sub>1</sub>, i.e.:

- (a) \*V<sub>1</sub> (-volitional + V<sub>2</sub> (transitive)  
+ agent)

\**śinkūn gheṇe* = 'to sneeze intentionally for oneself'  
sneeze take

- (b) Experiencer (dative-subject) verbs

\*V<sub>1</sub> ( - volitional + V<sub>2</sub> (transitive)  
- agent  
+ patient)

*rāg yeūn ṭākṇe*  
anger come drop  
'(For X) to get angry to get rid of it'

- (c) If V<sub>1</sub> cannot have a -volitional agent V<sub>2</sub> (intransitive) cannot be paired with it.

V<sub>1</sub> (+ volitional + V<sub>2</sub> (intransitive)  
+ agent)

\**prayatna karūn dzāne*  
effort do  
'To try inadvertently'

Examples (29.a) - (29.c) point out that if the semantic features of  $V_1$  do not match with those of  $V_2$  and the modification in the features of  $V_1$  is not possible due to the ontological nature of the action expressed by  $V_1$ , then,  $V_1$  cannot be paired with that  $V_2$ .

In order to match  $V_2$  in (29.a), which is +volitional and +control (of the agent) verb, it is necessary to modify  $V_1$  (which is -volitional and -control). However, ontologically, the action of sneezing is -volitional and -control (of the agent) in its nature. Therefore,  $V_1$  cannot be paired with  $V_2$ . Similarly, in (29.c),  $V_1$  expresses action (*prayatna karne* 'to try') which is ontologically impossible to perform without volition and control (of the agent). Therefore, it cannot be paired with an intransitive  $V_2$ . The constraint on pairing of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  also explains why the dative-subject-verbs (i.e. the verbs which have experiencer-subjects) cannot take transitive  $V_2$  (see example (29.b)). Experiencer/dative subject-verbs typically express a -volitional action over which the subject does not have any control (for further discussion on experiencer subjects in Marathi see Masica 1976, and Pandharipande 1989). Therefore, their incompatibility with a transitive (+volitional +control) verbs is only expected.

### 8.1 Interaction of syntax and semantics

The assumptions in (7.) also explain the split syntax of SVC. For example, recall (23) and (24). *Sudhā* (agent) in (23) fails to take the expected agentive *-ne* marking while *to* in (24) which should not take *-ne* obviously takes it. According to our hypothesis, in (23), the semantic features of  $V_1$  (+volition, +control (of the agent)) are modified to become compatible with  $V_2$  (intransitive) which has a theme subject. As a result, volitionality as well as control of the agent *Sudhā* is lowered. Consequently, *Sudhā* no more claims to be the volitional agent of the action (of doing the work) expressed by  $V_1$ . Since the *-ne* marking typically marks an agent (see Damle 1911, Pandharipande 1981), it is only expected that *Sudhā* (in 23) is not marked with it. Therefore the SV agrees with it. In contrast to this, in (24),  $V_1$  has a theme subject and  $V_1$  *dzhopne* 'to sleep' is low on the scale of volitionality and control. However, as a result of its pairing with  $V_2$  *ghene* 'to take', which is transitive, and has the features +volitional, and +control (of the agent), the volitionality and the control of the agent is raised. Therefore, the subject of  $V_1$  is the SV *dzhopūn ghene* 'to sleep for oneself' is more agent-like than the subject of single verb *dzhopne* 'to sleep'. Thus it is not a surprise that it takes the agentive marker *-ne* and the SV fails to agree with it.

The hypothesis about the modification of the semantic features of  $V_1$  further explains why the syntactic processes of passivization, and (perfective) participialization fail to apply to (13.a) (see 13.b)) even though the theme argument (i.e., *cūk* 'mistake') is present in the sentence. Since (as discussed above) the agent is downgraded (due to the influence of  $V_2$ ), the theme (*cūk* 'mistake') is further downgraded and does not have the status of the theme argument. Therefore, the syntactic construction of passivization and (perfective) participialization do not treat it as a 'real' theme of a transitive verb and thereby fail to operate on it (see 15.a). In contrast to this, the SV in (17) treats the subject as agent and therefore, following the ergative pattern, the (perfective) participialization fails to operate on it (see 17). This operation can be summarized as follows: If semantic structure of  $V_1$  is modified, then the nature of its arguments change and this change is reflected in the syntax of  $V_1$ .

More evidence for the hypothesis comes from the process of causativization. (recall examples (19) -(26)). Note that the  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  in the SVC in (19) have identical semantic features. Therefore, it is only as expected that the causative marking may be placed either on  $V_1$  (19.a) or on  $V_2$  (19.b). Ungrammaticality of (20) is justifiable on the basis of ontological incompatibility of the adverbial meaning 'inadvertantly' with the causative meaning 'to make causee do x (action)', i.e., a causee cannot be caused to perform an action inadvertently. Therefore (20) is ungrammatical.

#### 9. Conjunctive participial suffix -un and SVC: more evidence for compatibility of $V_1$ and $V_2$

In section (1.0) (examples (1) and (2)) it is noted that in SV,  $V_1$  shares the suffix *ūn* with the conjunctive participial construction in Marathi. The use of *ūn* in SVC is convincingly justified within our hypothesis as follows: the suffix *ūn* in SVC, similar to the conjunctive participial construction, signals (a) identity or compatibility of the arguments of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  and (b) completion of the action in  $V_1$  as exemplified in (30).

Conjunctive participle:

- (30) *to dzhad toḍūn gharī gelā*  
       he tree having cut home went  
       Having cut the tree, he went home.

Note that the agent of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  is identical<sup>2</sup> in (30) and the action in  $V_1$  is complete. Our earlier discussion shows that the arguments of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$



have to be compatible. The claim that in SVC action expressed by  $V_1$  is interpreted to be completed or realized, is supported by the fact that a progressive participle cannot be derived from a SVC (as noted in (18)). This interpretation of the realization/completion of the action expressed by  $V_1$  overrides the tense/aspect of overall SVC (indicated by the marking on  $V_2$ ), as in (31) where the SV clearly denotes the non-perfective aspect.

- (31) *to patra phēkūn deto*  
he letter throw give  
He throws away the letter.

Thus it is not implausible to assume that the completion of the action in  $V_1$  is signaled by the suffix *ūn* and that this interpretation is valid at the discursial level. More evidence to support the hypothesis regarding the completion of the action comes from the fact that a SV can not be readily negated, as illustrated in (32). Our hypothesis nicely predicts and accounts for the ungrammaticality of (32) since the interpretation of the completion of the action is incompatible with its negation.

- (32) \**to he bolūn baslā nāhī*  
he this say sat not  
He did not say this inadvertently.

#### 10. The affixal nature of $V_2$ in SVC

The analysis of the syntactic as well as semantic behavior of SVC is further supported by the fact that the  $V_2$  in SVC is affixal in nature. The following evidence supports this hypothesis: (a) they, similar to other verbal/nominal affixes and post-positions, are dependent on the  $V_1$  for the realization of the adverbial meaning. (b)  $V_2$  occurs in the position of tense, aspect, and agreement markers which categorically follow and not precede the main verb, (c) similar to post-positions,  $V_2$  influences the meaning of  $V_1$  and more importantly, changes its thematic role. Consider the following examples (33) and (33 a). When the post-position *kaḍūn* is added on to the agent of the verb, the thematic role of the agent is changed to that of an instrument and the action of doing is treated as non-volitional.

- (33) *rām ne kām kele*  
Rām ag. work did  
Rām did the work.

- (33.a) *rām kadūn kām dzhāle*  
*rām by work happened*  
*Rām did the work (literally, Rām was instrumental in getting*  
*the work done.)*

Similarly, when intransitive  $V_2$  follows a  $V_1$ , the action expressed by  $V_1$  is treated as -volitional and as discussed in section (8.) the nature of the arguments of  $V_1$  is changed. (c) Another piece of evidence to support the hypothesis comes from that Marathi, similar to many other (e.g., Hindi, Gujarati, Punjabi) Indian languages uses lexical verbs as suffixes (recall discussion section 1), therefore, affixal function of verbs is independently motivated in Marathi. (d) There are no other adverbial suffixes or adverbials which carry out the function of  $V_2$ s in the language. (e) The hypothesis about the affixal function of  $V_2$ s is further supported by diachronic evidence. Beams (1872) attributes the emergence of SVs in Indo Āryan languages to the loss of Sanskrit *upasargas* (suffixes) during the period between Sanskrit and New Indo Āryan. Directional and aspectual Sanskrit affixes (e.g. *ut* 'up', *apa* 'away', *pati* 'toward', *upa* 'close to', etc.) were gradually lost. The distinction between verbal suffixes of *ātmanepada* (indicating that the action is performed for oneself) and of *parasmaipada* (indicating that action is performed for someone else) was neutralized. This change was gradual through Pāli and Prākṛt (the phases of Middle-Indo-Āryan following Sanskrit) but became more dominant in Apabhraṃśa (the phase following Prākṛt) where a predominantly analytical system of grammar emerged. Case suffixes of Sanskrit and Prākṛt were replaced by postpositions. The use of a verb to replace an aspectual inflection had already with Pāli. However, in Old Marathi (11-13th century A.D.) the use of inflectional affixes is still predominant while the use of a verb to convey aspectual meaning is rare. In Modern Marathi however, a majority of the derivational suffixes of Sanskrit and Prākṛt indicating the direction or beneficiary of the action are completely lost. Thus there seems to be a correlation between the loss of affixes and the emergence of SVs in Marathi. Therefore, it is not surprising that the  $V_2$ s in SVC, similar to the affixes, express the conditions under which the action expressed by the  $V_1$  took place.

It is important to note here that not all verbs used as  $V_2$  are fully grammaticalized as affixes. There seems to be a hierarchy of grammaticalization of verbs. For example, the verbs used as aspectual markers (e.g., *as-ṇe* 'to be' (habitual), passive-marker (*dzā-ṇe* 'to go'), and the marker of a regularly performed action (*dzā-ṇe* 'to go') are fully grammaticalized. In contrast to this,  $V_2$ s in SVC are not fully grammaticalized. The evidence for this is discussed in section 1.

Additional evidence to support this claim comes from the fact that the fully grammaticalized verbal affixes can be added on to any verb (including to the same lexical verb) while the  $V_2$ s categorically fail to be  $V_2$ s if  $V_1$  is the same lexical verb. Consider the following:

- (34) *tū sājet dzāt dzā*  
 you school-in go go  
 (You) go to school regularly.

The following combinations of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are unacceptable:

- (35) (a) *basūn bas-ṇe* 'to sit inadvertently'  
 (b) *deūn de-ṇe* 'to give for someone else'  
 (c) *gheūn gheṇe* 'to take for oneself'

Note that in (34) (which does not involve a SVC construction) the verb *dzā* 'go' is used twice, first as the main verb and secondly, as the aspectual affix. Note that the resulting sentence is fine. On the other hand, in a SVC the same verb can not be used both as  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  since it presents semantic redundancy (35a - 35c). This indicates that the  $V_2$  is as "bleached out" of its lexical meaning as the  $V_2$  *dzā* 'to go' in (34).<sup>3</sup>

Even within the group of  $V_2$  some are more grammaticalized than others, i.e., *de-ṇe* 'to give', and *gheṇe* 'to take' are more grammaticalized as opposed to *pāh-ṇe* 'to see'. (In some varieties of Marathi *deūn de-ṇe* 'to give for someone else' is to a large extent, acceptable.)

The following additional evidence shows that the  $V_2$ s are not fully grammaticalized, i.e., their adverbial meaning emerges not only from its form but also from the attitudes of the speaker. For example, let us compare the adverbial meaning of the  $V_2$  *gheṇe* 'for oneself'. With the similar meaning of the reflexive particle *svataḥ sāṭhī* 'for oneself'. In (36), where SV *karūn gheṇe* 'to do for oneself' is used, the use of the word indicating beneficiary other than the subject, i.e., *āisāṭhī* 'for mother' should create discrepancy. However (36) does not present any discrepancy. In contrast to this, (37) where the reflexive particle *svataḥ* 'self' is used, the insertion of the word *āisāṭhī* 'for mother' creates discrepancy and the sentence is not acceptable.

- (36) *tyāne āisāṭhī te kām karūn ghetle*  
 he-ag mother-for that word do took  
 He did the work for (his) mother. (He felt that he was doing it for himself).

- (37) *\*tyāne*      *āisāthi*      *svataḥsāthi*      *te*      *kām*  
          he-ag.      mother-for      self-for      that      work  
  
          *karūn*      *ghetle*  
          do      took  
          He did the work for himself for his mother.

The difference between (36) and (37) can be explained if we assume that the reflexive meaning of *svataḥ* 'self' is fully grammaticalized, i.e., it can only refer to the subject of the sentence irrespective of the attitude of the subject or speaker. Therefore, the beneficiary of the action can not be anyone other than the subject. Thus, it is not surprising that the insertion of the word *āisāthi* 'for mother' creates discrepancy in (37). In contrast to this, if we assume that the reflexive meaning of *ghene* 'for oneself' in (36) is not fully grammaticalized, but rather, it depends on the attitude of the speaker, then it is expected that if according to the speaker, agent's doing the work for mother is comparable to during it for himself, then the use of *ghene* 'for oneself' in (36) should not create any discrepancy.

#### 11. Conclusion

The major points in the preceding discussion can be summarized as follows: (a) The SVC is different from other serial verb constructions in Marathi, since the combination of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  in SVC is neither fully fixed like compounds, nor is it totally free as other serial verbs in Marathi, (b)  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are paired on the basis of their semantic (and thereby syntactic) compatibility, which is subject to semantic constraints. This hypothesis is in consonance with Mishra's (1990) hypothesis of 'multiple linking' of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  in Hindi SVC, (c) change in the semantic features of  $V_1$  influence the syntactic features of its arguments, (d)  $V_2$ s are affix-like in their function. However, they are not fully grammaticalized and that there is a hierarchy of grammaticalization of verbal affixes in Marathi. There is dichronic evidence for assuming that historically, SVC emerged as a result of the loss of some affixes.

The discussion in this paper points out that the split properties of SVC, the constraints the compatibility of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  can be fully explained only if the morphology, syntax semantics, and pragmatics of SVC is taken into account. since interlinking of the levels of grammar (see sections 3. and 10.) is evident, one may ask whether it is useful or even possible to determine constraints on and properties of SVC exclusively in syntactic terms.

The paper also points out that the semantic representation of a verb not only includes its argument-structure but also other properties such as volitionality and control of the agent of the action expressed by the verb.

The discussion in this paper is also relevant for developing a typology of SVC in Indian languages in particular and SVC across different language-families in general. If the emergence of SVC in Marathi and other Indo-Āryan languages is due to the loss of affixes, then it is expected that (a) the languages which have preserved a relatively more synthetic/affixal structure should have relatively fewer SVs. In fact, this seems to be true in the case of Marathi vis-a-vis Hindi. Marathi, which has retained a larger number of affixes (case-marker) than Hindi, has fewer SVs than Hindi. However, a cross-linguistic study is needed to provide a conclusive statement about the status of SVs in Indo-Āryan languages, and (b) the paper points out that the SVC in Marathi stands between compounds (which are fully fixed) and V+ affix constructions (which are totally free). Perhaps, there is a scale of 'intimacy' between  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  in SVC across languages, on which each language occupies a particular position.

#### Notes

1. The sentence in (10) is grammatical if it is interpreted as a Conjunctive Participle Construction. In this case the sentence will translate as 'Having said this, he went home yesterday.'

2. It is to be noted here that  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  may have different subjects if there is a causal connection between the actions expressed by  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  respectively, i.e.,

<i>pāūs</i>	<i>paḍūn</i>	<i>dhānya</i>	<i>pikla</i>
rain	having	paddy	grew
	fallen		

The paddy grew due to the rainfall. (Literally, the rain having fallen the paddy grew).

For further discussion see Pandharipande 1989).

3. It may be argued here that the same verb can not be used as both  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  because  $V_1$  has all properties of  $V_2$  (including the adverbial

meaning). Therefore, repetition of the same verb causes redundancy. However, this argument fails since V<sub>1</sub>s in (35a) - (35c) when used as single verbs do not inhere the adverbial meaning which they express when used as V<sub>2</sub>s in SVC constructions.

### References

- Beams, John (1872) (Reprint 1970). A comparative grammar of the modern Aryan languages of India. New Delhi: Munshi Ram Manohar Lal.
- Damle, Damodar Keshav (1911) (Reprint 1965). Shastriya Marathi Vyakarana. Pune: Damodar Sawlaram ani Mandali.
- Foley, William and Robert D. Van Valin (1984). Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, Yamuna and Rajeshwari Pandharipande (1980). Toward a typology of compound verbs in South Asian languages. Studies in the Linguistic Sciences 10.1.113-114.
- Mishra, Mithilesh K. (1990). Against 'object sharing' in serial verb constructions. Paper presented at Mini-Conference on Serial Verbs, Ohio State University, Columbus.
- Pandharipande, Rajeshwari (1981). Transitivity in Hindi. Studies in Linguistic Sciences 11.2.161-179.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1981a). Syntax and semantics of the passive construction in selected South Asian languages. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1982). Volitionality: more evidence for a constraint on passive in Hindi. South Asian Review VI.3.89-103.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (in press). Experiencer (dative) Nps in Marathi. Experiencer Subjects in South Asian Languages (M.K. Verma and K. P. Monahan, eds.) Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.